

ATTACHMENT A

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

Update to the Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan

This study covers the update to the Heenan Lake Wildlife Area
Land Management Plan

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

Lead Agency:

California Department of Fish and Game
North-Central Region
1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Prepared by:



GALLAWAY
CONSULTING, INC.
115 Meyers Street, Suite 120, Chico, CA 95928
Phone (530) 343-8327 Fax (530) 342-1882

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED.....	2
Aesthetics	3
Agricultural Resources	3
Air Quality	4
Biological Resources	5
Cultural Resources	7
Geology, Soils and Seismicity	8
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	10
Hydrology and Water Quality	11
Land Use and Land Use Planning.....	12
Mineral Resources	13
Noise	13
Population and Housing	15
Public Services	15
Recreation.....	16
Transportation and Traffic.....	16
Utilities and Service Systems.....	17
Mandatory Findings of Significance	18

Environmental Checklist Initial Study

Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan

INTRODUCTION

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Project Title: | Heenan Lake Wildlife Area
Land Management Plan* (LMP) |
| 2. Lead Agency Name and Address: | California Department of Fish and Game
North-Central Region
1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 |
| 3. Contact Person and Phone Number: | Terri Weist: (530) 644-5980 |
| 4. Project Location: | Heenan Lake, Alpine County |
| 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: | California Department of Fish and Game
North Central Region
1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 |
| 6. General Plan Designation(s): | Open Space |
| 7. Zoning Designation(s): | AG: Agriculture |
| 8. Description of Project: | The LMP is a program intended to provide the framework for implementing the Department's management goals for the wildlife area. |
| 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: | North, West, South: Toiyabe National Forest.
Northeast, East: Bureau of Land Management. |
| 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: | None |

* The potential environmental impacts evaluated in this document address the long-term implementation of the proposed project (Land Management Plan for the Heenan Lake Wildlife Area). Future activities or development that may be proposed in the project area (that are separate from activities described in the LMP - and not considered exempt per statute or CEQA guidelines §§15301-15332) would be subject to a separate environmental review.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The proposed project could potentially affect the environmental factor(s) checked below. The following pages present a more detailed checklist and discussion of each environmental factor.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial study:

- ☒ I find that the Proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the Proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the project-specific mitigation measures described in Section III have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the Proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. No further action is required.

Shirley
Signature

10/24/2007
Date

Printed Name

Environmental Checklist

Aesthetics

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic highway?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

1.a – 1.d:

The existing facilities within the Heenan Lake Wildlife Area (HLWA) would require maintenance, and occasional repair, to achieve the established goals for the Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan (LMP). Activities related to facility maintenance and repair would likely include:

- Maintenance/repairs to the hatchery
- Maintenance /repairs to fencing and signage
- Maintenance/repairs to dam and spillway
- Repair/prevent erosion on existing access road to egg-taking station.

The proposed project does not propose large-scale changes that would alter the aesthetic characteristics of the site. The maintenance and repair of existing facilities could reduce potentially negative aesthetic impacts resulting from the degradation of these facilities. The project would have **no impact**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of the potential impacts of specific management goals relative to their anticipated benefits.

Agricultural Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
2. Agricultural Resources. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture.				

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | ☒ |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | ☒ |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? | ☒ |

DISCUSSION

2.a, 2.c:

The proposed project would not result in changes to existing agreements that address land use and water rights in the project area. The project would not conflict with guidelines intended to protect farmland or prevent its conversion to non-agricultural use. As of June 8, 2006, the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program classified all of Alpine County as "Local, State and Federal Owned Land" or "Out of Survey Area." Grazing is not allowed under current agreements in the HLWA. Currently, cattle are prone to enter the project area due to poorly maintained and inadequate fencing. Fence maintenance and improvements described in the LMP are intended to prevent grazing in areas currently not allowed. The project would not result in potentially significant impacts to agricultural resources. There would be **no impact**.

2.b:

The HLWA is zoned AG (agriculture) with an open space land use designation. While the property has been grazed in the past, implementation of the LMP would not reduce the amount of agricultural lands currently available in the area. Implementation of the proposed LMP would result in impacts that are considered **less than significant**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of the potential impacts of specific management goals relative to their anticipated benefits.

Air Quality

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				☒
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			☒	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that			☒	

exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?



DISCUSSION

3.a, 3.d, 3.e:

The proposed LMP would not result in the construction of new facilities or the generation of increased vehicular trips. Undeveloped lands, absent of sensitive receptors, surround the project site. The LMP does not propose activities that would generate objectionable odors. Neither specific maintenance activities identified in the LMP nor long-term implementation of the LMP would result in significant impacts. There would be **no impact**.

3.b, 3.c:

Some of the management tasks identified in the proposed LMP could result in emissions of criteria pollutants. These emissions would be subject to local, County and State regulations as well as Best Management Practices (BMP), identified by the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District (GBUAPCD). As Alpine County is a member of the GBUAPCD, activities related to management tasks in the proposed LMP would be subject to pertinent guidelines and BMPs required by the District. Emissions generated by management tasks would be temporary and would not contribute to the cumulative net increase of pollutants. Through adherence to local, regional, state and federal guidelines, and by implementing appropriate BMP as standard conditions of approval of any required permits, temporary emissions would result in **less than significant** impacts.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of the potential impacts of specific management goals relative to their anticipated benefits.

Biological Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? ☒
- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? ☒
- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan? ☒

DISCUSSION

4.a – 4.d:

The purpose of the project is to implement a framework that will facilitate the implementation of the management goals identified for the HLWA. The management goals include the following elements:

- Biological
 - Enhance/Restore sage grouse habitat
 - Management practices associated with aspen stand improvement projects
 - Conduct biological inventories
- Public Use
 - Continue to provide recreational catch and release/seasonal hunting public use
- Facility Maintenance
 - Develop and maintain necessary facilities for the Lahonton cut throat trout hatchery and administrative activities to manage the wildlife area.

The project is not expected to result in significant impacts to biological resources. The project would result in the increased ability to implement the proponent's management goals, which are intended to improve conditions for significant biological resources in the project area. Active management strategies will be implemented pursuant to relevant guidelines (including the Alpine County General Plan, the California and Federal Endangered Species Acts, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Clean Water Act, Fish and Game Code, et cetera) and recommendations in order to prevent potential impacts to significant resources. The LMP identifies the potential impacts of active management strategies described in the management goals of the HLWA:

- Wildlife assessments, trapping, netting and banding can cause stress, and occasionally harm, in individual specimens.
- Active management in aspen stands could include human intrusion, burning and cutting.
- Fences could present hazards to flying birds.
- Public use could cause disruptions to wildlife activities and harm/stress to individual cutthroat trout specimens during catch-and-release activities.
- Road maintenance could impact the lands adjacent to the areas being maintained.
- Maintenance of water conveyance facilities could impact the lands adjacent to the areas being maintained.

This document provides an evaluation of actions that are consistent with the LMP. The amount of review required for future projects and actions not identified in this LMP would be determined pursuant to article 11 and articles 18 and 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (addendums and statutory and categorical exemptions respectively). These potential impacts of the proposed LMP, which would be implemented pursuant to appropriate local, state and federal regulations, are

considered insignificant when compared to the benefits of the implementation of the project's management goals. Furthermore, the proposed LMP identifies appropriate measures that would ensure the implementation of the management goals do not generate potentially significant impacts. Through adherence to the recommended measures set forth in the proposed LMP, and relevant regulations, the proposed project would not result in the generation of potentially significant impacts. The project would have a **less than significant impact**.

4.e, 4.f:

The LMP is intended to protect and enhance the special-status species and habitats located within the project site. All management goals would be implemented pursuant to state and federal Endangered Species Acts as well as all other applicable regulations. The proposed LMP incorporates an ecosystem approach in its management goals. Thus, the actions proposed in one part of the plan are not evaluated independent of potential repercussions to other portions of the functioning ecosystem within the project area. Management tasks that promote a part, but hinder the health of the whole, are subsequently avoided. The LMP, which was developed using an ecosystem approach, and would be implemented pursuant to relevant guidelines, would not conflict with policies, plans or ordinances that are intended to protect biological resources. There would be **no impact**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of the potential impacts of specific management goals relative to their anticipated benefits.

Cultural Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

DISCUSSION

5.a – 5.d:

The project is not expected to result in construction or development of new facilities. Implementation of the LMP is not expected to result in large-scale ground disturbances. Maintenance and improvement of existing facilities would be implemented when necessary. Genesis Society conducted an Archaeological Survey for the proposed LMP in 2006. The survey identified the following potential impacts to cultural resources that may occur through implementation of the LMP:

- Direct impacts to previously identified and, as yet, unidentified historic resources
- Direct impacts to previously identified and, as yet, unidentified prehistoric resources
- Inadvertent impacts to previously undocumented cultural resources (historic, prehistoric or dual component)

- Inadvertent impacts to human remains or burials

The Archaeological Survey recommends the following tasks, as part of a cultural resource management approach, to eliminate any potentially significant impacts to cultural resources within the project site:

1. Inventory Survey: Synthesize data in from past surveys, compile new data, and prepare an archaeological inventory survey per CEQA guidelines.
2. Site Location Map: Any activities that could result in ground disturbances should be preceded by map consultation. This would preclude disturbances to known resources identified by the inventory survey and mapped by the site location map.
3. Properties or Human Remains Discovered
 - A. If previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered through the implementation of the LMP all work shall cease in the area. A professional archaeologist shall be consulted to evaluate the cultural resource(s) and, if necessary, describe appropriate mitigation to be implemented.
 - B. If human remains are discovered on the project site, work will cease in the project area and the coroner will be contacted immediately. Activities relative to newly discovered human remains will be regulated pursuant to applicable sections of the Public Resources and Health and Safety Codes.

The proposed LMP, as described in the Public Use Element, contains goals and objectives pertaining to the management and preservation of cultural resources. The Department's goal identified in this section is to "acquire additional information about the cultural sites within the HLWA..." The proposed LMP sets forth two primary tasks that would achieve this goal: 1) Review existing literature and 2) If data cannot be found, conduct site visits and obtain GPS coordinates of cultural sites. Thus, adherence to the proposed LMP would result in adherence to tasks 1 and 2 recommended in the archaeological survey. Consistency with task 3, as recommended in the archaeological survey, would be accomplished through adherence to relevant Public Resources and Health and Safety Codes. Management activities would not be allowed to cause detriment to cultural resources. The LMP requires the following cultural resource management tasks that closely mirror the recommendations of the Archaeological Survey:

- Site alteration would not occur without an appropriate resource survey.
- Sites would be monitored to assure public impacts are not occurring.
- Locations of known sites within the project area would not be made public, though the locations would be used to avoid impacts to known resources.

Through implementation of appropriate cultural resource management tasks, and by adhering to local, state and federal regulations, the proposed project would result in potential impacts to cultural resources that are considered **less than significant**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of the management goals relating to cultural resources and the avoidance of potential impacts.

Geology, Soils and Seismicity

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION

6.a, 6.c – 6.e:

Existing infrastructure would be maintained to ensure continued functionality, or improved to promote greater functionality, efficiency and lessen negative effects to wildlife resources. The implementation of the LMP would not result in the development of new facilities, or the creation of conditions, that would expose people or facilities to geologic hazards or unstable conditions at levels that are not currently experienced within the project site. The project does not propose new wastewater disposal systems. The project would result in **no impact**.

6.b:

Management activities, such as vegetation thinning in aspen stands, could result in the exposure of topsoil. Road maintenance activities could result in ground disturbances. These tasks would be implemented pursuant to the framework of the LMP, which is intended to improve environmental conditions within the HLWA. Future proposed activities, that are consistent with, but not identified as tasks within, the LMP would be subjected to review as required by CEQA. The amount of review required for future projects not identified in this LMP would be determined pursuant to articles 11, 18 and 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (Addendums and Statutory and Regulatory Exemptions respectively). Activities would also be regulated by pertinent local, state and federal regulations. Projects that could result in soil erosion or ground disturbances may be subject to regulation by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Department of Fish and Game and Alpine County. Through adherence to appropriate regulations and securing the required permits, management tasks that could result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil would generate impacts considered **less than significant**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of the potential impacts of specific management goals relative to their anticipated benefits.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

DISCUSSION

7.a, 7.b and 7.h:

The project would not result in placing people or structures at risk that are not currently at risk to hazards within the project area. There are no residences within, and no urbanized areas adjacent to, the HLWA. The project would not result in an increased hazard risk to people, structures or the environment. Prescribed burning has been used as a management tool to prevent the encroachment of conifers into aspen stands. The proposed LMP identifies prescribed burning as an option for the management of aspen stands within the HLWA. However, it is not specifically identified as tool that will be used in this manner. Besides the obvious safety hazards, improperly prescribed burns can negatively impact sage grouse habitat. Prior to implementation

of controlled burning, a fuels manager would consult with the DFG to ensure adherence to state regulations. Future proposed activities, that are consistent with, but not identified as tasks within, the LMP would be subjected to review as required by CEQA. The amount of review required for future projects not identified in this LMP would be determined pursuant to articles 11, 18 and 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (Addendums and Statutory and Regulatory Exemptions respectively). Consistency with the management goals identified in the proposed LMP and adherence to appropriate regulations would ensure hazardous materials and wildfire hazards generate impacts that are considered **less than significant**.

7.c – 7.g:

The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of a school, is not a recognized hazardous materials site, would not generate safety risks due to proximity to airports/airstrips or impair the implementation of response or evacuation plans. Risks currently experienced within the project site would not be increased through implementation of the LMP. There would be **no impact**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of the potential impacts of specific management goals relative to their anticipated benefits.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			☒	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			☒	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			☒	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			☒	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			☒	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			☒	

- g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? ☒
- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? ☒
- i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? ☒
- j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? ☒

DISCUSSION

8.a – 8.f, 8.i:

The erosion of an existing access road is identified in the LMP as a current contributor to degradation of adjacent habitat through sedimentation. Road maintenance is a management goal identified in the LMP. This maintenance would ensure continued safe access to the hatchery and minimize erosion from impacting adjacent habitats. Rather than resulting in potential impacts, road maintenance identified in the LMP would effectively minimize impacts that would occur if no action were taken. Maintenance activities and implementation of the LMP would place people and equipment within the vicinity of several water features within the project site. Future proposed activities, that are consistent with, but not identified as tasks within, the LMP would be subjected to review as required by CEQA. The amount of review required for future projects not identified in this LMP would be determined pursuant to §§15162-15164, article 11 and articles 18 and 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (Types of EIRs and Statutory and Regulatory Exemptions respectively). The implementation of an ecosystem-level management plan, with a primary goal of protecting the continued existence of Lahontan cutthroat trout, would require special consideration for hydrology and water quality. Any activities that may impact water quality would be subject to relevant local, state and federal regulations, including the Alpine County Code, the state and federal Endangered Species Acts and the Clean Water Act. Through adherence to appropriate regulations and securing of necessary permits, the project would result in impacts that are considered **less than significant**.

8.g, 8.h, 8.j:

The proposed project would not result in the construction of housing or structures. Existing hazards generated by the area's hydrology would not be heightened or exacerbated through implementation of the LMP. There would be **no impact**.

REFERENCES

See the attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of habitat degradation associated with road erosion, and the effective avoidance of potential impacts associated with maintenance goals in the LMP.

Land Use and Land Use Planning

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?



DISCUSSION

9.a – 9.c:

The project would not result in land use conflicts, which could impact communities or habitats. It is a management plan that would not result in the construction of facilities, but rather focuses on the maintenance and enhancement of facilities and habitats. Land use would not change as a result of the project. Currently there are no habitat or natural community conservation plans that are applicable to the HLWA. In the future, any proposed tasks would be required to adhere to habitat or conservation plans that may be applicable at that time. Currently, the protection and preservation characteristics of the LMP would not divide a community or conflict with plans policies or regulations. The proposed project would have **no impact**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of current land uses in the project area. The LMP would not result in changes to these uses.

Mineral Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
10. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

10.a, 10.b:

The proposed project would not result in lost availability of resources that would be available in pre-project conditions. The LMP would not result in resource extraction. The project would have **no impact**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for a description of land use history within the project site, which does not include mineral extraction.

Noise

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact

11. NOISE. Would the project:

- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION

11.a, 11.b, 11.d

Some activities identified in the proposed LMP could generate temporary increases in noise and ground-borne vibration levels. The HLWA is isolated and these temporary increases in levels are not expected to impact areas outside the project site. Future proposed activities, that are consistent with, but not identified as tasks within, the LMP would be subjected to review as required by CEQA. The amount of review required for future projects not identified in this LMP would be determined pursuant to articles 11, 18 and 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (Addendums and Statutory and Regulatory Exemptions respectively). Implementation of the management activities contained within the LMP would be required to remain consistent with relevant state and federal laws intended to protect special-status species and communities. Any potentially significant noise related impacts on wildlife resulting from management activities would be avoided through proper timing of management activities during biologically non-critical timeframes. Temporary increases in noise or vibration levels would result in potential impacts to humans, and wildlife, at levels considered **less than significant**.

11.c, 11.e, 11.f:

The proposed project would not result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels. The project would not result in the construction of residences or structures. Airport/airstrip-generated noise levels would not impact people within the project site at levels that are greater than currently experienced. The project would have **no impact**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of the potential impacts of the proposed Management Plan relative to the anticipated benefits.

Population and Housing

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

12.a - 12.c:

The proposed project consists of the implementation of a land management plan. The LMP would not induce growth directly or indirectly. The proposed project would not result in the construction or displacement of people or residences. No infrastructure that could induce population growth is proposed as part of the plan. The project would not construct residences, nor would it displace people or housing. There would be **no impact**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan, which describes surrounding land uses and land use history within the project site.

Public Services

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
13. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
a) Fire protection?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The proposed project would not result in impacts to service ratios, response times or performance objectives. The LMP would not create residences or infrastructures that would create new demands on public services. Future proposed activities, that are consistent with, but not

identified as tasks within, the LMP would be subjected to review as required by CEQA. The amount of review required for future projects not identified in this LMP would be determined pursuant to articles 11, 18 and 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (Addendums and Statutory and Regulatory Exemptions respectively). The proposed LMP is not expected to generate the need for additional or altered facilities that would be required to provide these public services. There would be **no impact**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan

Recreation

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
14. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

DISCUSSION

The project would not create increased demand on recreational facilities above existing levels. It would not include construction of new recreational facilities. Future proposed activities, that are consistent with, but not identified as tasks within, the LMP would be subjected to review as required by CEQA. The amount of review required for future projects not identified in this LMP would be determined pursuant to articles 11, 18 and 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (Addendums and Statutory and Regulatory Exemptions respectively). Existing public use activities, such as hunting, fishing and sightseeing, could result in impacts to the HLWA. As a component of the LMP, public use would be monitored to ensure impacts are not being generated within the HLWA. Information would be posted at points of public access that would inform the public on proper conduct within the HLWA. The project does not propose the expansion or construction of recreational facilities. The proposed LMP would not impact area parks or recreational facilities, as it would not result in the construction of residences or structures. The project would result in potential impacts that are considered **less than significant**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of public use within the project site.

Transportation and Traffic

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service (LOS) standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☒
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☒
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☒
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☒

DISCUSSION

15.a – 15.g:

The HLWA is accessed via Highway 89 by way of two unpaved roads. One of these roads continues along the eastern shore of the Lake and then along Heenan Creek. This road provides access to the egg taking station. The other unpaved road travels the western shore of the Lake and then turns southward towards Bagley Valley. These roads are gated and public access is limited to foot or horseback. The gates are a sufficient distance from the Highway and there is off street parking to alleviate the potential for traffic hazards generated by public use. The proposed project is an LMP and would not result in potential traffic impacts in the project area. Increased traffic, increased traffic hazards, degradation of LOS, impacts to air traffic patterns and other similar impacts are the results of projects that propose construction, population growth, increased daily trips, et cetera. The management activities included in the LMP would result in the maintenance of unpaved roads within the project site to avoid continued degradation. The proposed LMP is not expected to change the levels of use, and subsequently traffic volumes, in the area. The proposed project would result in **no impact**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan for further discussion of vehicular access to, and within, the project site.

Utilities and Service Systems

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				☒

- | | |
|---|---|
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | ☒ |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | ☒ |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | ☒ |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | ☒ |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | ☒ |
| g) Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | ☒ |

DISCUSSION

The proposed project is an LMP and would not result in increased demand on utilities or service systems. There are no residences in the HLWA and none would be constructed as a result of the proposed LMP. The proposed LMP would not result in the construction of new infrastructures, population growth or other similar effects. The proposed LMP would provide a framework for the maintenance and improvement of existing facilities. Future proposed activities, that are consistent with, but not identified as tasks within, the LMP would be subjected to review as required by CEQA. The amount of review required for future projects not identified in this LMP would be determined pursuant to articles 11, 18 and 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (Addendums and Statutory and Regulatory Exemptions respectively). The proposed LMP is not expected to result in potential impacts to utilities and service systems that are experienced currently within the project site. The project would have **no impact**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan

Mandatory Findings of Significance

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
17. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE. Would the project:				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered			☒	

plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) ☒
- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Disturb paleontological resources? ☒

DISCUSSION

17.a:

The proposed LMP would establish of a framework for the implementation of management goals identified for the project site. Implementation of these goals would not result in potentially significant environmental impacts. Rather, the project would result in a more effective management of special status species and related habitats. Relative to the above-mentioned environmental resources, the project is expected to result in benefits rather than potentially significant impacts. However, active management practices identified in the proposed LMP could result in impacts if not implemented after careful consideration of the area's environmental characteristics and pursuant to pertinent regulations. Future proposed activities, that are consistent with, but not identified as tasks within, the LMP would be subjected to review as required by CEQA. The amount of review required for future projects not identified in this LMP would be determined pursuant to articles 11, 18 and 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (Addendums and Statutory and Regulatory Exemptions respectively). All tasks that would be implemented as a result of the adoption of the proposed LMP would be conducted pursuant to relevant regulations. While there is the potential for specific tasks to generate impacts, the goal of the proposed LMP is to generate a net benefit for the site's biological and cultural resources. Adherence to all regulatory requirements, including acquisition of all necessary permits, would ensure the proposed project generates impacts at levels considered **less than significant**.

17.b:

The proposed LMP would not result in the construction of new infrastructures, population growth or other similar effects. The proposed LMP is expected to result in a net benefit for the area's environmental conditions. Potential impacts that might be generated by the implementation of the proposed LMP would be temporary in nature and less than significant. Future proposed activities, that are consistent with, but not identified as tasks within, the LMP would be subjected to review as required by CEQA. The amount of review required for future projects not identified in this LMP would be determined pursuant to articles 11, 18 and 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (Addendums and Statutory and Regulatory Exemptions respectively). As such cumulative potential impacts would occur at levels considered **less than significant**.

17.c:

Implementation of the proposed LMP would be carried out in accordance with all applicable regulations. Land use within the HLWA would not be significantly changed through implementation of the proposed LMP. As a result, direct and indirect impacts on human beings or paleontological resources are not anticipated. Future proposed activities, that are consistent with, but not identified as tasks within, the LMP would be subjected to review as required by CEQA. The amount of review required for future projects not identified in this LMP would be determined

pursuant to articles 11, 18 and 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (Addendums and Statutory and Regulatory Exemptions respectively).. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to generate impacts at levels that are considered **less than significant**.

REFERENCES

See attached Heenan Lake Wildlife Area Land Management Plan.